

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

KYLE FELLERS, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MARCEY KELLEY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:24-cv-311-SM-AJ

MOTION TO CORRECT ENDORSED ORDER

Plaintiffs move to correct the endorsed order entered on the docket on October 8, 2024. The endorsed order states:

ENDORSED ORDER re: [14] Emergency MOTION for Temporary Restraining Order. *Text of Order: Denied, for the reasons discussed on the hearing record, specifically plaintiffs' failure to meet its burden to establish likelihood of success on the merits.* So Ordered by Judge Steven J. McAuliffe.

At the hearing, however, the Court granted Plaintiffs' motion in part. The Court stated, "So in an effort to balance the equities somewhat, I will enter a restraining order allowing Mr. Fellers to attend his child's soccer games for the rest of the season." Hrg. Tr. at 78:8–11 (ECF No. 24). Plaintiffs thus request that the Court correct the Endorsed Order to reflect that the motion for a temporary restraining order was granted in part and denied in part for the reasons stated in the hearing record.

The undersigned counsel Endel Kolde sought consent for this motion from all defense counsel who have appeared to date. Counsel for the Bow S.D. Defendants and Lt. Lamy, Brian Cullen, indicated by email that he takes no position on the

motion. Eric Maher, also counsel for Lt. Lamy, had not responded to counsel's email as of the time this motion was filed.

Dated: October 17, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Endel Kolde

Endel Kolde*

DC Bar No. 1782129

Brett Nolan*

DC Bar No. 90014964

Nathan Ristuccia¹

Virginia Bar No. 98372

INSTITUTE FOR FREE SPEECH

1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.

Suite 801

Washington, DC 20036

202.301.3300

dkolde@ifs.org

bnolan@ifs.org

nrstuccia@ifs.org

By: /s/ Richard J. Lehmann

Richard J. Lehmann

New Hampshire Bar No. 9339

LEHMANN MAJOR LIST, PLLC

6 Garvins Falls Rd,

Concord, NH 03301

603.731.5435

rick@nhlawyer.com

* Pro hac vice

¹ Not a D.C. Bar Member but providing legal services in the District of Columbia exclusively before federal courts, as authorized by D.C. Ct. App. R. 49(c)(3).